

Investigation into the Wholesale Billing Practices of
Wisconsin Bell, Inc. d/b/a SBC Wisconsin

6720-TI-183

This form is designed to have carriers identify and document issues in advance of the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference. It will also be used to track issues as issues are discussed during subsequent prehearing conferences. Carriers are not precluded from raising additional issues at or even after the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference, but Carriers will be expected to complete this form as issues are subsequently raised. Notwithstanding, all carriers are encouraged to submit as many of their issues as possible prior to the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference. A date will be established at a subsequent prehearing conference after which no new issues will be permitted.

1. *Please complete a separate form for each issue.*
2. *Time permitting and to the extent possible, carriers with similar issues are encouraged to make a joint submission.*
3. *Please do not include any confidential and/or CPNI information. How to handle confidential and/or CPNI information will be discussed at the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference.*
4. *Please return to Nick Linden by e-mail (nicholas.linden@psc.state.wi.us) no later than the close of business (COB) Friday, July 25, 2003.*

Submitted by: SBC

Contact: **Richelle Barker**
Telephone Number: (414) 227-6915
e-mail: rb8434@sbc.com

Subject Matter Expert (SME): **Brian Van Hoof**
Telephone Number: (414) 227-6981
e-mail: bv3165@sbc.com

Authorized Representative: **Brian Van Hoof**
Telephone Number: (414) 227-6981
e-mail: bv3165@sbc.com

Name: **Minute of Use Disputes**
Brief Description: **CLECs have billed SBC for local and intralata toll minutes of use that did not originate from SBC end users. The total outstanding dispute is approximately \$12M. CLECs involved are:**
Northern Telephone and Data
Net LEC
ATT

TCG
MCI
Time Warner
KMC Telecom
McLeod/Ovation
TDS Metrocom
Choice One
CTC Communications
Sprint

Please answer the following questions:

1. When this issue was first discovered? **11/1998**
2. How many occurrences and approximately over how long a period of time?
Monthly occurrence since 1998
3. Is it a recurring problem? **Yes**
4. Your belief as to the cause of the problem. **Faulty CLEC billing system/logic that may not be removing UNE traffic, ported traffic or traffic originated by third parties from the minutes of use CLEC bills to SBC. Additionally, there is the potential that the CLEC billing systems could be using faulty logic in the creation of usage bills to SBC, such as billing SBC for connect time versus conversation time.**
5. Does this issue involve an interpretation and/or application of law, contract or tariff? If so, please explain. **This does not appear to be a contract or tariff issue to SBC. It appears to be more of a process issue with CLEC billing systems and processes.**
6. What priority would you give this issue? In other words, how would you rank this issue in terms of importance and urgency: High, Medium or Low? **High**
7. Any other pertinent information?

Please answer the following questions:

1. Was this issue raised with the opposing carrier? If so, when and how? **Each month that SBC receives an invoice with inappropriate charges, in accordance with the Interconnection Agreement, SBC notifies the CLEC of the dispute by sending a letter notifying the CLEC of the dispute type and the amount of the dispute. In some cases, SBC has gone so far as to provide a month worth of call detail to CLECs to justify the amounts SBC has paid and disputed. In most of these cases where data has been exchanged, SBC has also helped the CLEC identify flaws in CLEC billing system logic as well as helped identify other carriers that are sending traffic to CLEC.**
2. Was this issue escalated for dispute resolution? If so, when and in what forum? **In many cases, the dispute has been escalated per the dispute resolution section of the ICA.**
3. Last known position of the opposing carrier. **In many cases, CLECs assert that since the traffic came over the SBC trunk groups, SBC has responsibility for compensating CLEC for such traffic, even though transit traffic may come over**

the same trunk groups.

4. Were any bill adjustments made to resolve this issue? *In some cases, adjustments have been made, but only after extensive analysis of CLEC billing systems and data exchanges.*
5. Were any policies or procedures changed to address this issue? If so, what changes were made?

(Described relief desired or needed including, but not limited to, proposed changes to Performance Measurements (PMs).) SBC seeks to have CLECs credit SBC for minutes of use that SBC has disputed because those minutes did not originate from SBC end users. SBC also requests that CLEC refrain from billing SBC for these minutes of use on all future invoices.

(Briefly respond to submitting carrier(s) by either agreeing or disagreeing with statements made above, and by answering the following questions.)

A. Analysis of Issue

1. Your belief as to the cause of the problem.

TWTC response: TWTC believes that this issue may have more than one cause. Some of the dispute may result from not all of SBC's usage from its switch getting into SBC's billing system, as TWTC and SBC have discovered in the SBC-SWBT area. SBC is reviewing its systems in the SBC-Ameritech area.

Additionally, TWTC believes SBC is disputing traffic that is originated on SBC's system by other providers using SBC's network, like UNE-P providers. Without the 10 digit telephone numbers used by every UNE/UNE-P provider that SBC serves and the name of the provider, or their operating company code (OCN) using SBC's network, TWTC has no way to determine whether the traffic is SBC traffic or UNE/UNE-P traffic. That is, the traffic appears to be SBC traffic, and therefore, TWTC bills SBC accordingly. The information TWTC needs to bill UNE/UNE-P providers directly is exclusively in the control of SBC. SBC does not currently provide TWTC with complete information such as OCN or Company Name on these other carriers. SBC has advised TWTC that it is in the process of establishing a system to provide TWTC with the necessary information for TWTC to bill those providers. This is an issue that has been raised in the Billing Forums and the industry is working on a solution. Currently, SBC is developing a process that provides some of the information in a non-industry standard format and it has limitations on the media options for transmission of this data.

TWTC was not performing an LNP query on newly assigned NPA/NXX's for originating traffic from our switches. This impacted the 3 to 1 calculation for in-balance minute volumes. Currently, TWTC is correcting this issue and will be performing LNP queries on all traffic.

2. Does this issue involve an interpretation and/or application of law, contract or tariff? If so, please explain.

TWTC response: Not that we are aware of.

3. What performance measures can be implemented to monitor the desired system operation?

TWTC response: Given that the solution to this billing issue is in SBC's hands, it is not appropriate or necessary to impose a PM on TWTC.

4. Any other pertinent information?

TWTC response: Currently, SBC does not have a standard process across its operating areas (SBC-SWBT, SBC-Pacific Bell, SBC-Ameritech) to provide UNE/UNE-P information. Each SBC operating area is using different non-industry standard processes. The OBF (Ordering and Billing Forum) has

been discussing items related to UNE-UNE-P compensation issues. Recently an issue was received to address UNE/UNE-P originating traffic terminating to CLEC's for billing identification.

TWTC is identifying and removing from billing to SBC transit traffic originating from companies that are facility-based.

B. Prior Attempts to Resolve the Issue

1. Last known position of the submitting carrier.
TWTC response: See comments above.
2. Were any bill adjustments made to resolve this issue?
TWTC response: TWTC will adjust bills, as applicable, once resolution of the disputes have been determined.
3. How were the adjustments communicated to the submitting carrier? Please attach any relevant accessible letter(s).
TWTC response: The submitting carrier will have communication through the dispute resolution process of any adjustments.
4. Identify any other carrier(s) known to have experienced similar problems.
TWTC response: As mentioned earlier, the identification of UNE/UNE-P traffic is an industry-wide issue that has been, and is being discussed in various industry billing forums.
5. Did you identify any other problems arising from or related to this issue?
TWTC response: No other issues have been identified other than the LNP query issue outlined above.
6. What steps, if any, did you take to proactively identify other billing issues arising from or related to this issue? Please attach any relevant accessible letter(s).
TWTC response: TWTC is currently reconciling traffic with SBC in the SBC-SWBT area. We will be reconciling traffic with SBC in the Ameritech area.
7. Were any policies or procedures changed to address this issue? If so, what changes were made?
TWTC response: TWTC is currently changing our process to perform LNP queries on all traffic.

Submitted by: **Time Warner Telecom**
Contact: **Pamela H. Sherwood**
Telephone Number: **(317) 713-8977**
e-mail: **Pamela.sherwood@twtelecom.com**

Subject Matter Expert (SME): **Jill Blakeley and Lori Redovian**

Authorized Representative: **Pamela Sherwood**

Investigation into the Wholesale Billing Practices of
Wisconsin Bell, Inc. d/b/a SBC Wisconsin

6720-TI-183

This form is designed to have carriers identify and document issues in advance of the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference. It will also be used to track issues as issues are discussed during subsequent prehearing conferences. Carriers are not precluded from raising additional issues at or even after the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference, but Carriers will be expected to complete this form as issues are subsequently raised. Notwithstanding, all carriers are encouraged to submit as many of their issues as possible prior to the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference. A date will be established at a subsequent prehearing conference after which no new issues will be permitted.

1. *Please complete a separate form for each issue.*
2. *Time permitting and to the extent possible, carriers with similar issues are encouraged to make a joint submission.*
3. *Please do not include any confidential and/or CPNI information. How to handle confidential and/or CPNI information will be discussed at the July 30, 2003 prehearing conference.*
4. *Please return to Nick Linden by e-mail (nicholas.linden@psc.state.wi.us) no later than the close of business (COB) Friday, July 25, 2003.*

Submitted by: SBC

Contact: **Richelle Barker**
Telephone Number: (414) 227-6915
e-mail: rb8434@sbc.com

Subject Matter Expert (SME): **Brian Van Hoof**
Telephone Number: (414) 227-6981
e-mail: bv3165@sbc.com

Authorized Representative: **Brian Van Hoof**
Telephone Number: (414) 227-6981
e-mail: bv3165@sbc.com

Name: **Rate Disputes**
Brief Description: **CLECs have billed SBC incorrect rates for both local and intraLata toll usage. The outstanding dispute amounts for local rate disputes is approximately \$.3M and \$.7M for intraLata toll rate disputes. CLECs that have billed incorrect rates include:**
Northern Telephone & Data
Net Lec

TCG
Time Warner
KMC
McLeod/Ovation
TDS
Choice One
CTC Communications

Please answer the following questions:

1. When this issue was first discovered? *7/1998*
2. How many occurrences and approximately over how long a period of time? *Monthly occurrence since 1998*
3. Is it a recurring problem? *Yes*
4. Your belief as to the cause of the problem. *Inaccurate CLEC interpretation/application of the interconnection agreement or tariff.*
5. Does this issue involve an interpretation and/or application of law, contract or tariff? If so, please explain.
6. What priority would you give this issue? In other words, how would you rank this issue in terms of importance and urgency: High, Medium or Low? *Low Priority*
7. Any other pertinent information?

Please answer the following questions:

1. Was this issue raised with the opposing carrier? If so, when and how? *Each month that SBC receives an invoice with inappropriate charges, in accordance with the Interconnection Agreement, SBC notifies the CLEC of the dispute by sending a letter notifying the CLEC of the dispute type and the amount of the dispute.*
2. Was this issue escalated for dispute resolution? If so, when and in what forum? *In some cases, SBC has invoked informal and or formal dispute resolution with the CLEC in an attempt to resolve. The notification of escalation would have been done in accordance with the ICA and would have been via letter or email.*
3. Last known position of the opposing carrier. *Unknown in many cases.*
4. Were any bill adjustments made to resolve this issue? *Only minor if any credits received at all.*
5. Were any policies or procedures changed to address this issue? If so, what changes were made?

(Described relief desired or needed including, but not limited to, proposed changes to Performance Measurements (PMs).) SBC seeks credits from the CLECs that have billed SBC at incorrect local and intralata toll rates on an historic basis. Additionally, SBC seeks to have the CLECs correct the incorrect rates to avoid such disputes on prospective bills from the CLECs. Finally, SBC seeks to have carriers charge SBC an intralata toll rate that is no higher than the SBC access rate, unless a CLEC cost study proves a higher rate.

(Briefly respond to submitting carrier(s) by either agreeing or disagreeing with statements made above, and by answering the following questions.)

A. Analysis of Issue

1. Your belief as to the cause of the problem.

TWTC Response: The only rate-related dispute TWTC has received from SBC-Ameritech is a dispute concerning the Local Transport Rate Element that is applied to intralata toll minutes of use. TWTC is in compliance with the interconnection agreement which allows us to bill our tariff rates to toll minutes of use. TWTC's tariff includes a local transport element to recover the costs of our network from our interconnection points at the SBC tandems and end offices to our switches.

TWTC has correctly interpreted and applied the contract rates.

2. Does this issue involve an interpretation and/or application of law, contract or tariff? If so, please explain.

TWTC response: According to SBC, it involves an interpretation of the rates permitted under the interconnection agreement

3. What performance measures can be implemented to monitor the desired system operation?

TWTC response: TWTC believes that if there is a rate application problem, it is minor and is being resolved through negotiations between SBC and TWTC. Any imposition of performance measures for TWTC with respect to billing issues is inappropriate and unwarranted at this time.

4. Any other pertinent information?

TWTC response: These disputes are minor and need not take up the Commission's attention. TWTC has received disputes for toll rates in the amount of \$2,673.98 through the May 2003 bill. TWTC has not received any disputes from SBC for incorrect local rate application.

B. Prior Attempts to Resolve the Issue

1. Last known position of the submitting carrier.

TWTC response: There are no major rate application issues. The minor rate application dispute is addressed above.

2. Were any bill adjustments made to resolve this issue?

TWTC response: No, not for rate application issues. The local transport element dispute issue will be resolved in normal dispute resolution processes.

3. How were the adjustments communicated to the submitting carrier? Please attach any relevant accessible letter(s).

TWTC response: Not applicable.

4. Identify any other carrier(s) known to have experienced similar problems.

TWTC response: TWTC does not discuss contractual rates with other CLECs.

5. Did you identify any other problems arising from or related to this issue?

TWTC response: No other problems arose from the discussions.

6. What steps, if any, did you take to proactively identify other billing issues

TWTC Response to SBC rate issues

arising from or related to this issue? Please attach any relevant accessible letter(s).

TWTC response: Not applicable.

7. Were any policies or procedures changed to address this issue? If so, what changes were made?

TWTC response: None

Submitted by: **Time Warner Telecom**

Contact: **Pamela H. Sherwood**

Telephone Number: **(317) 713-8977**

e-mail: **Pamela.sherwood@twtelecom.com**

Subject Matter Expert (SME): **Jill Blakeley and Lori Redovian**

Authorized Representative: **Pamela Sherwood**